DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 716 SO 031 873

AUTHOR Johnson, Ruth S.
TITLE Whole School Inquiry That Promotes Equitable Student Outcomes.
PUB DATE 2000-04-27
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Educational Change; *Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Outcomes of Education; School Effectiveness; Student Educational Objectives
IDENTIFIERS Paradigm Shifts

ABSTRACT

The present era is one of accountability, high-stakes standardized testing, and standards-based reform. However, there is a relative absence of meaningful discussion of how to achieve equitable outcomes that do not unfairly penalize the most under-served students. This paper challenges the perpetuation of reform practices that do not measure their effectiveness on equitable student outcomes. The paper proposes a paradigm shift that embraces the need to change cultures and to challenge assumptions and belief systems that block or abort efforts of meaningful reform; a paradigm shift whereby schools are held accountable for how well they educate "all" students in an equitable fashion. Schools and communities must engage in inquiries that reveal institutional practices that contribute to low performance and they must gather data to measure "distribution of learning opportunities." The paper contends that they must then have the will and be bold enough to take the steps and risks to make the necessary fundamental changes in schools and districts. Educators must embrace data as part of their reform strategy, questions must be posed, and data must be gathered and analyzed to assess how well schools and districts confront and address equity issues. The paper discusses the notion of whole school inquiry as a part of school reform, and describes an example of the researcher's personal experiences in facilitating school and district inquiries that are focused on equitable student outcomes and some "lessons learned." (Contains 19 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 716

WHOLE SCHOOL INQUIRY THAT PROMOTES EQUITABLE STUDENT OUTCOMES

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana

Ruth S. Johnson
California State University, Los Angeles

April 27, 2000

SO 031 873

Ruth S. Johnson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Whole School Inquiry that Promotes Equitable Student Outcomes
Ruth S. Johnson

Introduction and Background

Despite countless school reform efforts during the last two decades of the 20th century, we begin the 21st century with continuing gaps in academic achievement among different groups of students. These gaps separate large percentages of low achieving, low-income, African American, Latino and Native American students from other groups of mostly higher income, Asian and white students.

Beginning in 1970 national longitudinal results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicated a narrowing of the achievement gap, but this progress came to a screeching halt in 1988. In fact, the gap between African American, Latino and their white counterparts has widened since 1988, particularly at the upper levels of the education pipeline (Blank and Gruebel, 1995; Haycock, 1998; Viadero, 2000; Williams, 1996).

Simplistic explanations of why these gaps exist are not sufficient. For example, Singham (1998), reports that in Shaker Heights, Ohio, a predominantly African American and white middle and upper middle class community, large academic achievement disparities at the high school exist between African American and white students. Despite having an enrollment of equal numbers of African American and white students, the composition of the general education track is about 95% African American, while the composition of Advanced Placement classes is about 90% white.

Generic approaches of "one size fits all" can offer little explanation for the consistent achievement gap among large percentages of African American, Latino, Native American and low-income students. Distribution of learning opportunities and their social and economic consequences are virtually unchanged. Orfield (1988) suggests that the reformers of the 1980s operated under faulty assumptions:

> They much too simply assumed that whatever would be good for the suburban students would also help their central-city and poor rural counterparts. Too often they ignored the fact that, in a society profoundly fragmented by race and income, policies that work for one type of school may often misfire in or even do harm to other schools. Schools differing in fundamental ways will almost certainly be affected differently by the same policy (p.47).

Presently, we are in an era of accountability, high stakes standardized testing and standards-based reform. However, there is a relative absence of meaningful discussion of how to achieve equitable outcomes that do not unfairly penalize the most under-served students. I define equity "as an operational principle for shaping policies and practices which provide high expectations and appropriate resources so that all students achieve at the same rigorous standard — with

minimal variance due to race, income, language or gender"(Hart and Germaine-Watts, 1996, p xx).

High stakes testing creates a climate in which test scores may be raised by retention, push outs, and placement in special education instead of creating fundamental changes in the academic culture (Allington and McGill-Franzen, 1992; Allington and McGill-Franzen; 1992; Johnson, 1996). Although these reforms promote the notion that all students have the right to be educated to the same high standards, there are conflicting beliefs and values as to whether a social justice agenda of universal high achievement for all students is possible.

There is some evidence that clear goals and standards do show promise of helping in the effort to raise student performance in low achieving schools (Haycock, 1999). This focus on outcomes may be a necessary, but not a sufficient condition to improve outcomes for all students. Winfield and Woodard (1994) strongly urge us also to examine inputs, i.e. whether and which students are afforded "opportunities to learn," using indicators such as content covered, materials used, quality of teaching and learning and support systems. These indicators need to be monitored as stringently as test scores and graduation rates. If not, this reform movement, like others, will fail many of our young people. Changing content and performance standards without fundamentally transforming educators' practices, processes and relationships, and can never succeed.

This paper challenges the perpetuation of reform practices that do not measure their effectiveness on equitable student outcomes. I propose a paradigm shift that embraces the need to change cultures and to challenge assumptions and belief systems that block or abort efforts of meaningful reform. I propose a paradigm shift whereby schools are held accountable for how well they educate *all* students in an equitable fashion. In order to do so, schools and communities must engage in inquiries that reveal institutional practices that contribute to low performance. They must gather data to measure "distribution of learning opportunities." Then they must have the will and be bold enough to take the steps and risks to make the necessary fundamental changes in schools and districts. In order to do so, educators must embrace data as part of their reform strategy. Questions must be posed and data must be gathered and analyzed to assess how well schools and districts confront and address equity issues.

In the following sections I will discuss the notion of whole school inquiry as a part of school reform, describe an example of my experiences in facilitating school and district inquiries that are focused on equitable student outcomes and some "lessons learned."

Why Whole School Inquiry? Offering Help and Hope

Whole school inquiry is a paradigm shift from a data provider culture to a data user culture. From a culture that provides data to external requesters, such as the state, the district, funders or the media. This "data provider" role allows others to define criteria of progress upon which the school or district will be judged. McLaughlin (1997) describes this as "the evaluation food chain." He describes the food chain this way:

> Local educators-teachers, guidance counselors, administrators and staff- live at the bottom of what can be termed the "evaluation food chain." At the top of the chain, federal and state legislators demand data on initiatives they fund, compelling federal and state program officers to require data from the technical assistance providers, state departments, districts, professional development organizations, and others who receive the funding. These service providers, in turn, require that those they serve who work in classrooms, schools and districts provide them with data in exchange for offering continued service to these local clients. At every stage in this food chain, someone is seeking to scrape together whatever data they can to feed the "beast" which threatens to devour them, their programs, and their jobs. The response to such demands for high stakes accountability data typically is, "Give them the data they want and maybe they will leave us alone" (p. 3)

When they transition from data providers to data users, schools are able to define indicators of progress, provide explanatory information and raise hard issues. Assumptions that have never been questioned are tested, encouraging more provocative inquiry, and constant internal monitoring of progress toward input and outcome standards, and goals. As one educator said, "It wasn't my love for numbers, but my passion for children that led me to study and use school and district data. Data providers let others do all the thinking. I became a data user"(Johnson, 1996, p. 21).

Wheelock (1996) argues that schools' own practices often work to squander the talents of young people, and these practices must change" (p.xx). The need for whole school inquiry emerges from fostering a learning community created through collaborative leadership. When school and districts are persistent in their use of data to answer questions, there is unlimited potential to build capacity to provide equitable education. A process of problem solving emerges that allows school teams to assess patterns of learning opportunities for various groups of students. This highlights the gaps between rhetoric and reality and the extent to which policies and practices may foster or inhibit equitable school outcomes. Collaborating in teams creates a shared vision and shared responsibility. Thus, there is more potential to penetrate cultures that negatively affect student opportunities (Anderson, Herr and Nihlen, 1994; Johnson, 1996; Olsen and Jaramillo, 1999).

Creating a culture of whole school inquiry involves asking the right questions and looking for the authentic answers and solutions. This gets at the heart of how data stimulates school change. This occurs by analyzing relevant data, and

probing perceptions about why things are as they are. Analyzing policies and practices provides powerful opportunities to reveal patterns of institutional racism, such as those defined by Cummins (1989):

> Institutionalized racism can be defined as ideologies and structures which are used to systematically legitimize unequal division of power and resources between groups which are defined on the basis of race...The term "racism" is being used here in a broad sense to include discrimination against both ethnic and racial minorities. The discrimination is brought about both by the ways particular institutions (e.g. schools) are organized or structured and by the (usually) implicit assumptions that legitmize that organization. There is usually no intent to discriminate on the part of educators; however, their interactions with minority students are mediated by a system of unquestioned assumptions that reflect the values and priorities of the dominant middle class culture. It is in these interactions that minority students are educationally disabled (p.52).

Furthermore, whole school and district inquires advance dialogues related to low expectations and unequal access to programs, knowledge and resources. Data can be a lever to not only describe student outcomes, but students' access to meaningful content and effective teaching. Rich dialogue can provide early opportunities to assess and understand the beliefs and values that drive norms of behavior in the school culture (Johnson, 1996).

Facilitating Equitable School Change

The setting: The setting for the first whole school inquiry was an urban district in Southern California, with a diverse student population, both in ethnic make-up and socioeconomic status. Disaggregated data indicated that African American and Latino students were at the bottom of the achievement ladder. The high schools were tracked, and the district had low college going rates.

The problem: Some board members and the minority community were raising concerns about the academic achievement of low income and minority students. The board was questioning the role of the counselors and some were pressuring for the elimination of the counseling position. It was not clear what counselors did with their time and there were no measurements to provide evidence of accomplishments in the counseling program. There were divergent points of view about the counselors' role, even within the counselor ranks. The assistant superintendent requested assistance from the author and Phyllis Hart, Director of the Achievement Council (a non-profit organization in California addressing equity issues). The invitation came because Phyllis's work with the College Board in changing counseling systems to better serve all students and my work in school change and data use strategies. All of our work involved issues of access, equity, and opportunity to learn.

The goals: The district's solution was to fix the counseling program. Rather than "fixing counselors" in a program that had no coherence or common mission, we

proposed a goal, which would develop a change model that focused on access and equity. The process to get there would involve the transformation of counseling philosophy and delivery systems, and in system and school policies that were a barrier to access and equity. These became agreed upon goals. Because of the dissatisfaction at the board and central office with high school outcomes, the short term goals aimed at increasing access to higher level courses and increasing college enrollment rates of African American and Latino students. Initially, our unit of change was the three comprehensive high schools and two continuation high schools. This created an additional challenge, as high schools tend to be more resistant to change and are more content than student focused. Change efforts rarely start at this level. We would work 12-K instead of K-12.

This strategy would involve penetrating the district and school's culture, disturbing the "status quo," challenging myths, assumptions, values, beliefs, and practices of the system. If was necessary to design methods to examine and propose fundamental changes in the system, instead of focusing on isolated programs. Sarason (1990) argues that changes have not taken hold over the long haul because we are not transforming the routine behaviors, habits and expectations that operate throughout the organization. The counselors would play a critical role, but they would work in collaboration with administrators, teachers, parents and higher education.

The process of moving from a traditional model of data provider to data user evolved over a three-year period. We were attempting to change a highly resistant culture, where most were not interested in tampering with existing policies and practices. Data had to play a central role in order to confront the inequities.

Inquiry Questions: The leadership teams and the central administration with the assistance of outside change agents developed the inquiry questions There were a number of inquiry questions focusing on distribution of learning opportunities for different student groups. Are students from different racial and gender groups receiving the same opportunities for higher learning? What types of outcomes are evident for different groups of students? What student placement patterns and policies emerge by programs, courses and tracks? How are counselor resources distributed? Are counselors' and administrators' evaluations linked to access and equity goals? How does the district monitor and evaluate progress? Who is accountable for outcomes?

Methods: We began the journey by developing leadership teams that included counselors, and administrators. These teams expanded to include teachers and parents. Initially our inquiry model began with the central office and outside change agents posing questions and developing methods for collecting information. There were several stages of data collection and analyses. It was not a straightforward practice although we had some ideas of major areas that

needed to be addressed. Many times when the leadership teams pondered over the data, they questioned why the results were as they were. They lacked answers and had to dig deeper for better explanatory information. Many explanations were based on assumptions rather than evidence. As the process evolved, the counselors took the leadership role in deciding what questions to ask, how and when to collect data, and lines of responsibility.

In order to provide multiple layers of information for investigation and reflection by the school community we did the following:

- Assessed the academic culture of the school/district
- Established indicators of the schools'/district academic health.
- Assessed differential expectations/behaviors on the part of staff in providing different groups of students' opportunities to learn the curriculum.
- Utilized the voices of students and parents to improve access to academic courses and college-going opportunities.
- Assessed equity and opportunities to learn by using disaggregated data by groups, including test scores, program placements, course enrollments and college-going rates.

We used qualitative methods such as, structured and informal interviews, surveys and questionnaires and quantitative methods such as, descriptive statistics and standardized test data. We were granted permission by the California Department of Education to revise and use a high school questionnaire on course enrollments. Most of the information of academic indicators was available in the district. We were able to obtain the actual California public college going rates from the California Postsecondary Commission.

The following data collection occurred:

- As a first step in assessing the culture, we interviewed all of the high school counselors and administrators.
- At the same time we gathered baseline data on achievement opportunities and outcomes for students by disaggregated groups. This included test scores, program placements, course enrollments and college-going rates by race and ethnicity.
- We surveyed 5110 high school students to assess aspirations, their perceptions of their parent s' expectations, their course enrollments and their perceptions of teacher and counselor behaviors.
- We surveyed high school parents about aspirations for their children
- We surveyed all seniors about college aspirations and submission of college and financial aid applications.
- We assessed course offerings in English and mathematics.

Fortunately, the superintendent provided support from the office of research and evaluation and from computer services to assist with entering, summarizing and cross tabulating the data. This became invaluable in looking at aspirations and actual college enrollments and at issues related to assumed meritocracy.

Our Findings: As a result of our collaborative inquiries, we had findings in three major areas. The first one was achievement outcomes, the second, the academic culture and counselor expectations related to access and equity, and the third, assumptions, practices and patterns that were impediments to learning opportunities.

The achievement outcome data were as expected. When disaggregated, they clearly showed that African American and Latino students were at the bottom the achievement ladder on every indicator compared to their white counterparts. These indicators included high stakes test scores and higher level English and mathematics course enrollments.

Higher percents of African American (35%) and Latino (43%) were enrolled in general courses without a focus on college in contrast to Asian (27%) and White students (30%). In examining focus of high school classes we found that 61% of Asian students and 59% of White students were enrolled in these classes. Only 42% of Latino and 49% of African American students were enrolled in these classes.

The district collected baseline data on the numbers of remedial courses in preparation for improving learning opportunities. There were 28 sections of remedial English and 32 sections of remedial math. This began a practice of monitoring course offerings at the district level. African American and Latino students were enrolled more frequently in these courses than their Asian and White counterparts.

In the analysis of information about the academic culture and expectations regarding access and equity, it appeared that counselors in general attributed low achievement patterns to student and parent behaviors. These comments characterized the general climate, "hard (for us) to do better; poor students; no incentive at home." It was suggested that African Americans and Latino students and parents had low aspirations and educational expectations. These perceived low expectations were acted on by counselors placing these students in low track classes and maybe at best encouraging them to attend two-year community colleges. This reflects the findings of Cicourel and Kitsuse (1963) regarding the powerful influence counselors have on educational decisions and sorting of students related to economic status described by (Spring, 2000).

Inquiry was not a part of the school culture. Neither counselors or administrators engaged in problem solving or internal program level evaluation and monitoring of student tests scores, grades, attendance, suspensions, actual 2 or 4 year college going rates and how students were placed in classes. There was no sense of college going rates by neither racial and ethnic groups nor the rates from year to year. There was, however, an exception to this pattern. In one high school, the high track students were in a program that segregated them from the other student groups. There was information about their achievement and their

college enrollment. A select group of teachers worked with them and these teachers consistently monitored their progress. In contrast to other student groups, these students were highly supported and the adults that worked with them had high expectations for their success. The students in this program generally came from middle to high-income homes, were mostly white and had influential parents.

Administrators had no clear sense of how to evaluate counselors. The counselors saw their role more as personal counselors rather than leaders in the area of access and equity. When asked about strengths many indicated a desire to help kids, and they felt that they had a caring staff, obviously missing was any reference to access and equity.

The most compelling findings were in the area of practices and policies that were barriers to learning opportunities. There were rigid placement patterns that were solely based on test scores. When we asked the counselor about placement practices in algebra they cited the test scores as the main indicator. There was an assumption that African Americans and Latinos were not placed in algebra because of test scores. It was asserted that their system was bias – free and based on merit. We tested this assumption by combining multiple indicators of test scores, and algebra placements by racial and ethnic groups. The examination of actual practices revealed interesting differences. Proportionally, Asian and White students had higher placement rates than African American or Latino students even when achievement on tests indicated that the placements should be similar. Asians had a 64% placement rate, Whites, 61%, African Americans, 51% and Latinos, 42%. The educators in the district were most startled by these data because they exposed systemic biases. Use of these data helped to accelerate changes in placement practices.

Furthermore, we tested the assumptions that counselors and administrators had about African American and Latino student's aspirations for college going. They assumed low aspirations for both groups. In practice they did not inquire as to these students' and parents' college aspirations. Our findings reflected the voices of high school students and parents. Only 11% of African American parents and 13% percent of Latino parents expected their children to attend two-year colleges. Only 16% of African American students and 22% of Latino students expected to go to two-year colleges. In contrast to these expectations enrollment rates were much higher. African American enrollment in two-year colleges was 42%, while Latino enrollment was 38%. Upon initial examination of this information the leadership teams were pleased. However, a different story emerged when the four-year college aspirations were examined. A high percent (55%) of African American parents and 49% of African American students desired four-year college enrollment. Only 8% enrolled in a four-year college. Similarly, 39% of Latino parents, and 38% of Latino students expected to go to four-year college. The actual college going rate was a mere 9%. The leadership teams were sobered when they examined this data in contrast to the two-year

data. Clearly, the schools and district were out of touch with these parent and student expectations. Their assumptions about these groups' expectations for college were unsubstantiated.

Prior to the schools engaging in inquiry practices, the counselors were without strategies to assess and monitor the status of seniors' college and financial aid applications. In fact, the counselors had spent little time thinking about collecting this kind of information and were not sure that it was worth the time. However, some were curious about what they might find out and the other counselors supported them. So, the counselors decided to collaborate with the social studies teachers to survey every senior. The counselors and administrators were startled by the results of the first senior survey. There were 36%, 42% and 50% of seniors at each of the three comprehensive senior high schools who indicated that they wanted to go to college, but had not filled out an application. This was in the spring of their senior year. These findings moved the counselors into action and had implications for further changes in practice that will be described later. They quickly brought together all of these seniors, with representatives from the two-year institutions. The enrollment deadlines were met, but it was too late for four-year colleges. The counselors realized that many students had missed opportunities because of ineffective practices.

These findings were presented and examined by all of the high school leadership teams in collaboration with the central office. Large blocks of time were allocated for school teams to dialogue. When the process began, the teams were in retreat settings to minimize them from day to day distractions so they could focus on the work.

Some Major Actions and outcomes

Many of the myths, expectations and assumptions about the reasons for distribution of learning opportunities were dispelled when the leadership teams were confronted by the data. There was a realization that many of the disparities in learning opportunities for different groups of students were based on the institutional practices and policies. These policies and practices were implemented routinely by counselors, teachers, and administrators. This became a wake-up call and underscored the necessity of changing policies and practices at both the school and district levels.

Some of the major actions that were taken were:

- Over a three-year time span a collaborative leadership group of counselors, teachers and administrators developed systems to monitor their progress toward achieving access and equity in learning opportunities. Guided by a set of inquiry questions such as, What are parent and student interest and

expectations? What are teacher, Counselor and Administrator expectations? etc. They established the types of indicators, the methods for collecting data, data sources and responsible persons.

- The counselors designed an internal system to monitor student coursework, grade point averages, college test participation, and submission of college and applications and college acceptances. They met with 8th grade students and parents during the summer vacation to assess career aspirations and four-year college plans and to design four years of coursework.
- Counselors worked to collaborate with teachers, parents, and higher education to develop more responsive informational and support strategies for underrepresented students.
- Teachers and counselors worked more collaboratively towards a common goal. To improve communication, planning and monitoring, counselors left their offices and began to attend department meetings.
- The counselors changed counseling practices to reach more students more frequently. They reallocated how they spent their time by transitioning from an exclusively individual counseling mode to using effective group counseling strategies. They were more collaborative with each other and also with other staff. They began to move from a "gatekeeper" role to more of a student advocate role.
- The evaluation system for counselors and administrators changed. Administrators were not held accountable for tests score alone. They were required to provide indicators of progress toward to access and equity. They had to become skilled at collecting and analyzing information. They were provided with technical support.
- Administrators were trained on how to evaluate counselors in relationship to goals. The evaluation of counselors included information on progress related to all students' access to learning opportunities.
- The other levels of the system became engaged in the work. Middle school counselors, teachers and administrators formed collaborative leadership teams to address the issues of access and equity.
- Mathematics became a focus area for access to learning opportunities. Barriers needed to be removed. Leadership teams of mathematics teachers were created in each high school. General math was eliminated from the district curriculum. Higher level mathematics courses increased.
- As a result of counseling record keeping in one high school, they were able to show great strides. The percent of students enrolled in college prep and honors courses changed from the 40% range to the 80% range in a span of five years.
- PSAT tests were administered on Tuesdays rather than Saturdays to allow more students to participate.

Some lessons

This paper described some of the powerful potential for school wide inquiry to influence changes. The focus of our inquiry was access and equity related to the distribution of opportunities. It involved many schools over a multi-year period. During this time lessons were learned. At times we were exhilarated by the process and at other times disheartened. One always hopes that when schools analyze the information and see the disparities in learning opportunities that they will do the "right thing" –promptly remove the barriers and change practices. At times this occurred, but at other times the process moved more slowly. We were attempting to change a culture that had been in place for decades. We developed a balance of impatience and patience, but remained relentless in keeping everyone focused on the goals and in reminding them when their rhetoric and action were in conflict. I will discuss some of the major lessons we learned. Time and space limit me to highlighting just a few lessons.

The Politics: Public schools function in the context of a district culture. Conflicting district policies can be impediments to movement. The whole school inquiry experiences described in this paper were quite ambitious because it involved both the schools and the district. This created tension at times. They blamed each other for ineffective polices and practices. The schools wanted changes in curriculum and course offerings and placement policies more quickly than central administration. On the other hand, because of the opportunities for collaboration, the school leadership teams had more access to central administration and they were able push their agendas based on findings from the data. The central administrators became more sensitive to issues that schools were dealing with and began to make the necessary changes.

Many were fearful of what the inquiries would reveal. They were not sure how the information would be used. Some were fearful because they had no clue about what to change and some were resistant to change. Others were simply plagued by a kind of phobia, which suggests that you must be a statistician or mathematician to understand or work with data.

There was discomfort in disaggregating the information by racial and ethnic groups. Some did not want to share information with the board or community. There was a reluctance to use the terms African American or Latino and code words such as our "high risk", or low achievers were used. There were fears of being called racist or prejudiced and fear of confrontations. Also the teams were uncomfortable in sharing information with their school colleagues. They needed professional development in this area.

If equity issues are going to be authentically addressed, the school community will have to confront beliefs and values. They will need to have the courage and gain the skills to engage in "learning experiences that will disturb, demystify and dismantle several fundamental constructs that are accepted *a priori* as truths within the dominant paradigm of public education"(Hart and Germaine-Watts,

1996, p. 3). Determining where the school is requires individual and collective reflection. A climate of trust, risk-taking and openness must be fostered. The work must focus on the institutional practices and behaviors that perpetuate inequities. Individuals will have to determine how their behaviors contribute to those practices. Schools and districts need to develop effective strategies to help those willing to change or to assist those unwillingly to change in transitioning to environments that are better suited to their talents and skills.

School teams will need professional development to confront these issues. It also is important for professionals to be well informed and to have a theory of action. Becoming familiar with the literature that addresses these issues can be a first step (See Johnson, 1996).

Organization: It took approximately three years for the teams to own the inquiry process. Initially, they saw it as the role for the outside change agents. We realized that the lack of ownership was a factor of how schools and districts go about their daily work, a lack of responsibility designations and a perceived lack of skill in inquiry methods and skills. Based on this information, the leadership teams decided to create a data team composed of individuals from each of teams. They would be responsible for the organization of the work, but the inquiries would still be generated by the leadership teams.

The teams needed technical skills training. They also needed further professional development in qualitative action research approaches such as those suggested by Anderson, Herr and Sigrid-Nihlen, 1996). Resources and time needed to be allocated and reallocated to this effort.

When time and resources are provided, the work is deemed valuable. Relegating this type of work to an after school activity devalues the process and power of the inquiry. When the organization supports the work though the allocation of appropriate resources, there is more potential to change the culture.

Communication: Students and parent voices must be a critical part of the communication pipeline. Too many times, explanations for African American and Latino student and parent behaviors were inaccurate. The institutions acted on this inaccurate information as though it was authentic, resulting in numerous lost learning opportunities for students.

The power of the inquiry process should be communicated to the entire school community. As schools analyze information, design authentic action strategies and monitor progress, they will need to share the power of how this process can positively impact students. We found that whole school inquiry enabled schools to offer more substantive explanatory information about student outcomes and how they were addressing areas that needed to improve.

References

Allington, R.L.& McGill-Franzen, A. (1992). Does high-stakes testing improve school effectiveness? ERS-Spectrum, 10(2), 3-12.

Allington, R.L. &McGill-Franzen, A. (1992). Unintended effects of education reform in New York. Educational Policy, 6(4), 397-414.

Anderson, G.L., Herr, K. & Sigrid Nihlen, A. (1996). Studying you own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bland, R. & Gruebel, D. (1995) State indicators of science and mathematics education 1995. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Cicourel, A.V., & Kitsuse, J.I.(1963). The educational decision-makers. New York, N:Y: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering minority students. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Hart, P.J. & Germaine-Watts, J. Introduction in Johnson, R.S. (1996) Setting our sights: Measuring equity in school reform. Los Angeles: The Achievement Council.

Haycock, K. (1998). Achievement in America speech. Keynote speech delivered at Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Haycock, K. (1999). Dispelling the myth: High poverty schools exceeding expectations. Washington, DC: The Educational Trust.

Johnson, R.S. (1996) Setting our sights: Measuring equity in school reform. Los Angeles: The Achievement Council.

McLaughlin, R.T., ed. (1997). The evaluation forum proceedings, New England Desegregation Assistance Center Press, Brown University: Providence, RI.

Olsen, L. & Jaramillo, A. (1999) Turning the tides of exclusion: A guide for educators and advocates for immigrant students. Oakland, CA: The California Tomorrow Equity-Centered Reform Series.

Orfield, G. (1988) Race, income, and educational inequality. School success for students at risk. Orlando, FA: Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sarason, S.B. (1990) The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Singham, M. (September, 1998). The Canary in the mine: The achievement gap between black and white students. Phi Delta Kappan.88-94.

Viadero, D. (2000, March 22). Lags in minority achievement defy traditional explanations. Education Week. 1,18-19, 21-22.

Williams, B. (Ed.). (1996). Closing the achievement gap: A vision for changing beliefs and practices. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wheelock, A. (1996) Forward in Johnson, R.S. Setting our sights: Measuring equity in school reform. Los Angeles: The Achievement Council.

Winfield, L.F.& Woodard, M.D. (1994). Assessment, Equity, and diversity in reforming America's schools. Educational Policy. 8(1), 3-27.